

CUMULANTS IN NONCOMMUTATIVE PROBABILITY THEORY II. GENERALIZED GAUSSIAN RANDOM VARIABLES

FRANZ LEHNER

ABSTRACT. We continue the investigation of noncommutative cumulants. In this paper various characterizations of generalized Gaussian random variables are proved.

CONTENTS

1. Preliminaries	1
2. Spherical symmetry and related characterizations	3
3. Linear Forms. The Skitovič-Darmois theorem and its relation to Cramér's and Marcinkiewicz' theorem	6
4. Quadratic forms. Lukacs' theorem	9
References	14

Generalized Gaussian random variables and Brownian motions have a long history in non-commutative probability theory and noncommutative central limit theorems. For a systematic study see [GM02]. In this paper we consider generalized Gaussian random variables from the point of view of combinatorial cumulant theory as developed in our paper [Leh02], to which we refer as part I. Our aim is to prove characterizations of Gaussian random variables, as found in [KLR73] and [Bry95] for classical Gaussian distributions. There are essentially two kinds of characterizations. The proofs of the simpler ones like spherical symmetry, Bernstein's and Lukacs' theorems can be immediately transferred to the non-commutative case, while other theorems, notably including Cramér's and Marcinkiewicz' theorems, do not hold in general.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper we will consider a fixed noncommutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ and an exchangeability system $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{U}, \tilde{\varphi}, \mathcal{J})$ for $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ as defined in part I. The interchangeable images of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{U}$ will as usual be denoted by $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \geq 0}$, and we shall identify $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{A}_0$. We shall moreover assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a $*$ -algebra and that all considered random variables are selfadjoint.

Date: February 1, 2008.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 46L53, Secondary 05A18.

Key words and phrases. Cumulants, partition lattice, Möbius inversion, free probability, noncrossing partitions, noncommutative probability.

Supported by the European Network N^oHPRN-CT-2000-00116 and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Project N^oR2-MAT.

Definition 1.1. We say that two random variables X and $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ have the same distribution given $\mathcal{E}$, if for any word $W = W_1 W_2 \cdots W_n$ with $W_i \in \{X\} \cup \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{A}_i$ the expectation $\tilde{\varphi}(W)$ does not change if we replace each occurrence of X by Y . We call X and Y $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. if in addition they are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. Similarly a sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{E}$ -independent random variables is called $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. if for any word $W = W_1 W_2 \cdots W_n$ with $W_i \in \{X_i : i \in \mathbf{N}\} \cup \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{A}_i$ the expectation $\tilde{\varphi}(W)$ does not change if we apply a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ to the indices of X_i , i.e., if we replace each occurrence of X_i by $X_{\sigma(i)}$.

We will need the following weak variant of pyramidal independence (cf. Definition I.3.10).

Definition 1.2. Let X_i be an *interchangeable sequence* of (centered) random variables, that is, for every permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ and every choice of indices $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n$ the expectation does not change under permutations:

$$\varphi(X_{\pi(i_1)} X_{\pi(i_2)} \cdots X_{\pi(i_n)}) = \varphi(X_{i_1} X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_n}).$$

We say that the *singleton condition* holds if

$$\varphi(X_{i_1} X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_n}) = 0$$

whenever one of the X_i 's occurs exactly once.

Let us start this section by quoting a general noncommutative central limit theorem.

Theorem 1.3 ([BS96]). *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ be a noncommutative probability space, and $X_i = X_i^* \in \mathcal{A}$ be a sequence of exchangeable random variables. For a partition ν denote*

$$\varphi(\nu) = \varphi(X_{i_1} X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_n})$$

where $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$ is any multiindex with kernel ν . Assume that $\varphi(X_i) = 0$, $\varphi(X_i^2) = 1$ and moreover that the singleton condition of Definition 1.2 holds. Then the sequence $S_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_1^N X_i$ has limit distribution

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(S_N^{2n+1}) = 0 \qquad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(S_N^{2n}) = \sum_{\nu \in \Pi_{2n}^{pair}} \varphi(\nu)$$

Interchangeable sequences generate interchangeable algebras and give rise to exchangeability systems. In view of the preceding noncommutative central limit theorem we define Gaussian families as follows (see also [GM02]).

Definition 1.4. An interchangeable family (X_i) of random variables is called (centered) *Gaussian* if all cumulants which correspond to non-pair partitions vanish. In other words, there is a function on pair partitions $\nu : \Pi_n^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that for all $h : [n] \rightarrow I$

$$(1.1) \qquad \varphi(X_{h(1)} X_{h(2)} \cdots X_{h(n)}) = \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \Pi_n^{(2)} \\ \pi \leq \ker h}} \nu(\pi)$$

In particular, odd moments vanish and the singleton condition holds.

Noncommutative (i.e. operator valued) Khinchin inequalities are available for Gaussian families, see [Buc01].

In the following all random variables are assumed self-adjoint and the state $\tilde{\varphi}$ is assumed to be faithful. This is needed for the following crucial lemma to be valid.

Lemma 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{U}, \tilde{\varphi}, \mathcal{J})$ be an exchangeability system for a C^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ with $\tilde{\varphi}$ faithful. Let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $X^{(1)} \neq X^{(2)}$. Then $K_2^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X) > 0$.*

Proof. By Good's formula

$$K_2^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X) = \varphi((X^{(1)})^2 - X^{(1)}X^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2}\varphi((X^{(1)} - X^{(2)})^2) > 0$$

□

2. SPHERICAL SYMMETRY AND RELATED CHARACTERIZATIONS

We review now some characterizations of classical Gaussians which may or may not hold in the general framework of definition 1.4. A simple characterization is the following.

Proposition 2.1. *Let X and Y be $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. noncommutative random variables such that $\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}$ has the same distribution as X (and Y). Then X and Y are centered Gaussian.*

Proof. We have to show that for every partition π the cumulant $K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X)$ vanishes unless π is a pair partition. Indeed, whenever there is a block B of length $m \neq 2$, then the assumption and Good's formula (Proposition 1.2.8) imply

$$K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X) = K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$$

where

$$X_i = \begin{cases} \frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}} & \text{if } i \in B \\ X & \text{if } i \notin B \end{cases}$$

and because of vanishing of mixed cumulants we obtain

$$K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = 2^{-m/2} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X) + 2^{-m/2} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X'_1, X'_2, \dots, X'_n)$$

where

$$X'_i = \begin{cases} Y & \text{if } i \in B \\ X & \text{if } i \notin B \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X) = 2^{1-m/2} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X)$$

which is only possible if the cumulant vanishes. □

The following generalization holds. See [Bry95, Thm. 3.3.1] for the classical case.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X_i be a sequence of $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. random variables and suppose that there are real numbers $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \neq 0$ such that $\sum a_i X_i$ has the same distribution as $X = X_1$. Then X is gaussian.*

Proof. Comparing the second cumulant we get

$$K_2^{\mathcal{E}}(X) = \sum a_i^2 K_2^{\mathcal{E}}(X)$$

and by Lemma 1.5 we infer that $\sum a_i^2 = 1$. The rest of the proof is the same as the proof of Proposition 2.1. □

Another characterization of classical Gaussians is *Maxwell's theorem*. Its analogue for classical exchangeable random variables was proved by [Kin72], namely that spherically symmetric exchangeable classical random variables are conditionally i.i.d. normal. For the free case see [Nic96].

Definition 2.3. A family (X_i) of random variables is *spherically symmetric* if for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and for every real orthogonal matrix $U \in \mathcal{O}(n)$ the families $Y_i = \sum U_{ij} X_j$ and X_i have the same joint distribution.

Theorem 2.4. An infinite interchangeable family (X_i) is Gaussian if and only if it is spherically symmetric.

Proof. Assume X_i is gaussian and let $U = [U_{ij}] \in \mathcal{O}(n)$ be an arbitrary orthogonal matrix, i.e., $\sum_j U_{ij} U_{kj} = \delta_{ik}$. Fix an index map $g : [m] \rightarrow [n]$. Then by multilinearity we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(Y_{g(1)} Y_{g(2)} \cdots Y_{g(m)}) &= \sum_{h: [m] \rightarrow [n]} U_{g(1), h(1)} U_{g(2), h(2)} \cdots U_{g(m), h(m)} \varphi(X_{h(1)} X_{h(2)} \cdots X_{h(m)}) \\ &= \sum_{h: [m] \rightarrow [n]} U_{g(1), h(1)} U_{g(2), h(2)} \cdots U_{g(m), h(m)} \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \Pi_m^{(2)} \\ \pi \leq \ker h}} \nu(\pi) \end{aligned}$$

this is zero unless m is even and in the latter case

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m^{(2)}} \nu(\pi) \sum_{\substack{h: [m] \rightarrow [n] \\ \ker h \geq \pi}} U_{g(1), h(1)} U_{g(2), h(2)} \cdots U_{g(m), h(m)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m^{(2)}} \nu(\pi) \prod_{\{a, b\} \in \pi} \sum_j U_{g(a), j} U_{g(b), j} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m^{(2)}} \nu(\pi) \prod_{\{a, b\} \in \pi} \delta_{g(a), g(b)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \leq \ker g} \nu(\pi) \\ &= \varphi(X_{g(1)} X_{g(2)} \cdots X_{g(m)}) \end{aligned}$$

For the converse, we are going to prove that if the X_i are even and if for each n there exists a orthogonal matrix, none of whose entries has modulus 1 and which leaves the joint distribution invariant, then only the cumulants of order 2 are nonzero.

Suppose $(X_i)_{i=1,2,\dots,n}$ has the same distribution as $Y_i = \sum U_{ij} X_j$ for some orthogonal matrix with the above property. We have to show that the cumulants corresponding to non-pair partitions vanish. Let $\pi = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_p\} \in \Pi_m$. Because the X_i are even, we can easily dispose of partitions with singletons, so assume that all blocks have cardinality at least 2.

Then by multilinearity

$$\begin{aligned}
K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) &= K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X_{\pi(1)}, X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(m)}) \\
&= K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(Y_{\pi(1)}, Y_{\pi(2)}, \dots, Y_{\pi(m)}) \\
&= \sum_{h: [n] \rightarrow [n]} U_{\pi(1), h(1)} U_{\pi(2), h(2)} \cdots U_{\pi(m), h(m)} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X_{h(1)}, X_{h(2)}, \dots, X_{h(m)}) \\
&= \sum_{\ker h \geq \pi} U_{\pi(1), h(1)} U_{\pi(2), h(2)} \cdots U_{\pi(m), h(m)} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) \\
&= \prod_{\pi_j \in \pi} \left(\sum_k U_{j,k}^{|\pi_j|} \right) K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X)
\end{aligned}$$

and by assumption each $\sum_k U_{jk}^{|\pi_j|}$ where $|\pi_j| > 2$ has modulus strictly less than 1 and thus the product is different from 1 unless all block sizes are equal to 2. $\square$

Actually a stronger characterization holds, known as *Bernstein's theorem* or *Kac-Loève theorem* [Fel71, §III.4].

Proposition 2.5. *Let X_1 and X_2 be $\mathcal{E}$ -independent noncommutative random variables and assume that the random variables $Y_1 = \alpha X_1 + \beta X_2$ and $Y_2 = \gamma X_1 + \delta X_2$ are also $\mathcal{E}$ -independent with $\alpha\gamma + \beta\delta = 0$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \neq 0$ (that is, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix}$ has orthogonal columns). Then X_1 and X_2 are (shifted) gaussian and have the same variance.*

Proof. The $\mathcal{E}$ -independence of Y_1 and Y_2 implies vanishing of mixed cumulants, in particular

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= K_2^\mathcal{E}(Y_1, Y_2) = \alpha\gamma K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1) + \beta\delta K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2) \\
&= \alpha\gamma(K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1) - K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2))
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore $K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1) = K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2)$. Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} K_n^\mathcal{E}(Y_1, Y_1, \dots, Y_1, Y_1, Y_2) \\ K_n^\mathcal{E}(Y_1, Y_1, \dots, Y_1, Y_2, Y_2) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{n-1}\gamma K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1, \dots, X_1) + \beta^{n-1}\delta K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2, \dots, X_2) \\ \alpha^{n-2}\gamma^2 K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1, \dots, X_1) + \beta^{n-2}\delta^2 K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2, \dots, X_2) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{n-2}\gamma K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_1, X_1, \dots, X_1) \\ \beta^{n-2}\delta K_n^\mathcal{E}(X_2, X_2, \dots, X_2) \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

and since the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible (if not, the random variables Y_1 and Y_2 are actually scalar multiples of each other and cannot be $\mathcal{E}$ -independent), the higher order cumulants vanish. $\square$

For the multidimensional version of Bernstein's theorem we need the following class of matrices.

Definition 2.6. A matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbf{R})$ is called *reducible* if there are permutation matrices C_1, C_2 such that

$$C_1 A C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Otherwise A is called irreducible. Equivalently, A is irreducible if it does not commute with any projection of the form $P = \sum_{i \in I} e_{ii}$.

Proposition 2.7 ([HNY99, Thm. 3.5]). *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ be a C^* -probability space with φ faithful. Let $X_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ (with $n \geq 3$) be centered $\mathcal{E}$ -independent random variables and let U be an irreducible orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix such that $Y_i = \sum U_{ij} X_j$ are also $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. Then the X_i are $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. Gaussian.*

Proof. First let us prove that all X_i have the same variance. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} K_2^\mathcal{E}(Y_i, Y_j) &= \sum_{k,l} U_{ik} U_{jl} K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_k, X_l) \\ &= \sum_k U_{ik} U_{jk} K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_k, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

i.e., if we set $\Xi = [K_2^\mathcal{E}(X_i, X_j)]$, $H = [K_2^\mathcal{E}(Y_i, Y_j)]$ (both are diagonal matrices by assumption and have nonzero diagonal entries by Lemma 1.5), then we have

$$H = U \Xi U^t.$$

Because the spectrum is invariant, it follows that we can also write H as a permutation of Ξ : $H = C^t \Xi C$. Consequently $CU \Xi = \Xi CU$ and CU is irreducible and commutes with the spectral projections of Ξ . The latter have the form $\sum_{i \in I} e_{ii}$ and therefore Ξ is a multiple of the identity matrix. To conclude the proof we have to show that the higher order cumulants vanish. Note that every row of U has at least two nonzero entries. (If there is only one nonzero entry, the other rows must have zero in the corresponding entry because of orthogonality, causing the matrix to be reducible). We fix an index k and assume without loss of generality that the entries $U_{1,k}$ and $U_{2,k}$ are nonzero. Consider for $m \geq 3$ the identity

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= K_m^\mathcal{E}(Y_i, Y_1, Y_1, \dots, Y_1, Y_2) \\ &= \sum_j U_{ij} U_{1j}^{m-2} U_{2j} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_j, X_j, \dots, X_j) \end{aligned}$$

which holds for every i . Therefore we have by orthogonality

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_i U_{ik} \sum_j U_{ij} U_{1j}^{m-2} U_{2j} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_j, X_j, \dots, X_j) \\ 0 &= \sum_j \delta_{jk} U_{1j}^{m-2} U_{2j} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_j, X_j, \dots, X_j) \\ &= U_{1k}^{m-2} U_{2k} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_k, X_k, \dots, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_k, X_k, \dots, X_k) = 0$. □

3. LINEAR FORMS. THE SKITOVICH-DARMOIS THEOREM AND ITS RELATION TO CRAMÉR'S AND MARCINKIEWICZ' THEOREM

In the classical case, an even stronger result than Bernstein's theorem holds, known as *Skitovich-Darmois theorem*.

Theorem 3.1 ([KLR73, Ch. 3]). *Let for $n \geq 2$ classical independent random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ be given and let a_i, b_i be real numbers for which $a_i b_i \neq 0$ for each i . Assume that the linear statistics*

$$Y_1 = a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 + \dots + a_n X_n \quad Y_2 = b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_n X_n$$

are independent. Then X_i are all gaussian.

This theorem heavily depends on Marcinkiewicz' and Cramér's theorems.

Theorem 3.2 (Marcinkiewicz [Mar39, Bry95]). *Let X be a classical random variable with only finitely many non-vanishing (classical) cumulants. Then X is normal, i.e., all cumulants of order greater than 2 vanish.*

Theorem 3.3 (Cramér [Fel71, §XV.8]). *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be classical independent random variables such that their sum $X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n$ is normal. Then all X_i are normal.*

In the general case Marcinkiewicz' and Cramér's theorems do not hold, for example in free probability [BV95]. Counterexamples to both can be fabricated from the following theorem, which shows that the free cumulants of order higher than 2 can take more or less arbitrary values.

Theorem 3.4 ([BV95, Thm. 2]). *For every $r > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the Taylor coefficients c_n of every function $f(z) = -z + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{n+1} z^n$ analytic in $\{z : |z| < r\}$ which satisfies $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$ and $|f(z)| < \delta$ for every z are the free cumulants of a probability measure.*

Corollary 3.5. *For small enough ε there exists a selfadjoint random variable X (equivalently, a probability measure on the real line) with free cumulants $K_1^{\mathcal{F}}(X) = 0$, $K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(X) = 1$, $K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X) = \varepsilon$ and $K_n^{\mathcal{F}}(X) = 0$ for $n \geq 4$.*

This lemma can be used to show that the analogue of Skitovič' theorem fails in the free case if there are at least three random variables involved.

Proposition 3.6. *There are free random variables X_1, X_2, X_3 which are not semicircular and such that $Y_1 = a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 + a_3 X_3$ and $Y_2 = b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3$ are free.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.5 there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every ε with $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ there exists a selfadjoint random variable $X(\varepsilon)$ such that all free cumulants of $X(\varepsilon)$ are zero with the exceptions $K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(X(\varepsilon)) = 1$ and $K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X(\varepsilon)) = \varepsilon$. Let X_1, X_2, X_3 be a free family where $X_1 \sim X(\varepsilon/4)$, $X_2 \sim X(\varepsilon)$ and $X_3 \sim X(\varepsilon)$,

$$Y_1 = 2X_1 - X_2 + 2X_3 \quad Y_2 = 2X_1 + 2X_2 - X_3$$

Then Y_i have vanishing mixed cumulants:

$$\begin{aligned}
K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(Y_1, Y_2) &= a_1 b_1 K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(X_1, X_1) + a_2 b_2 K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(X_2, X_2) + a_3 b_3 K_2^{\mathcal{F}}(X_3, X_3) \\
&= 4 - 2 - 2 = 0 \\
K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(Y_1, Y_1, Y_2) &= a_1^2 b_1 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_1, X_1, X_1) + a_2^2 b_2 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_2, X_2, X_2) + a_3^2 b_3 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_3, X_3, X_3) \\
&= 8 \cdot \frac{1}{4} + 2 - 4 = 0 \\
K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_2) &= a_1 b_1^2 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_1, X_1, X_1) + a_2 b_2^2 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_2, X_2, X_2) + a_3 b_3^2 K_3^{\mathcal{F}}(X_3, X_3, X_3) \\
&= 8 \cdot \frac{1}{4} - 4 + 2 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and for all $n \geq 4$ we clearly have $K_n^{\mathcal{F}}(Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}, \dots, Y_{i_n}) = 0$. $\square$

Definition 3.7. Let $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{U}, \tilde{\varphi}, \mathcal{J})$ be an exchangeability system for $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$. We say that *Marcinkiewicz' theorem holds* in $\mathcal{E}$ if a selfadjoint random variable X , which for some fixed m satisfies $K_\pi^{\mathcal{E}}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = 0$ whenever one of the blocks of π consists of more than m copies of X 's, must be gaussian.

We say that *Cramér's theorem holds* in $\mathcal{E}$ if for any decomposition $X = X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n$ of a selfadjoint gaussian random variable X into $\mathcal{E}$ -independent random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$, the summands X_j themselves must be gaussian.

Theorem 3.8. *In an arbitrary exchangeability system Marcinkiewicz' theorem and Cramér's theorem imply the Skitovič-Darmois theorem.*

Proof. We follow the proof of [KLR73]. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ be $\mathcal{E}$ -independent random variables and a_i, b_i nonzero real numbers. Assume that the random variables $Y_1 = a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 + \dots + a_n X_n$ and $Y_2 = b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_n X_n$ are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. After rescaling the X_i 's we may assume that $a_i = 1$ for all i . The assumed independence relations imply for every pair of real numbers (α, β) the following identities for the cumulants.

$$(3.1) \quad K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(\alpha Y_1 + \beta Y_2) = \alpha^m K_m^{\varphi}(Y_1) + \beta^m K_m^{\varphi}(Y_2)$$

$$(3.2) \quad = \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha^m + \beta^m b_j^m) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_j)$$

$$(3.3) \quad K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(\alpha Y_1 + \beta Y_2) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha + \beta b_j)^m K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_j)$$

$$(3.4)$$

Let us first consider the case that the b_j are pairwise different. Then we can differentiate the identity

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha^m + \beta^m b_j^m) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha + \beta b_j)^m K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_j)$$

k times with respect to β and evaluate at $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$ and obtain

$$m(m-1)(m-2) \cdots (m-k+1) \sum b_j^k K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_j) = 0$$

if $m > n$, this gives rise to a regular Vandermonde system and therefore $K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_j)$ must vanish. Marcinkiewicz' theorem then implies that the X_j are gaussian.

If some of the b_j 's are equal, we can group the X_j 's with equal coefficients together, and the considerations above imply that the sum of the X_j 's in each group is gaussian. Then Cramér's theorem implies that the individual X_j 's are gaussian. $\square$

As noted above, Marcinkiewicz' theorem and Cramér's theorems do not hold for free independence, but they do hold e.g. for boolean independence, see [SW97].

4. QUADRATIC FORMS. LUKACS' THEOREM

The next result is known as *Lukacs' theorem* in classical probability [Fel71, §III.6].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ be a sequence of noncommutative $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. random variables for which the singleton condition of Definition 1.2 holds. Then X_i are gaussian if and only if their sample mean $S_1 = \sum X_k$ and sample variation $T = \sum (X_k - \frac{1}{n}S_1)^2 = \sum X_k^2 - \frac{1}{n}S_1^2$ are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent.*

Proof. To prove necessity, choose any $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix $U = [U_{ij}]$ with first row $U_{1j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. Then by Maxwell's theorem 2.4 the random variables $X'_i = \sum U_{ij}X_j$ are also $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. Consequently $S_1 = \sqrt{n}X'_1$ and

$$T = \sum X_k^2 - \frac{1}{n}S_1^2 = \sum X_k'^2 - X_1'^2 = \sum_{j=2}^n X_j'^2$$

are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent.

In order to prove sufficiency of the condition, we show that the presence of a block of length at least three in a partition implies that the corresponding cumulant vanishes. It is enough to consider the full cumulants, the argument for partitioned cumulants is entirely similar. Thus assume $m \geq 3$, then the $\mathcal{E}$ -independence of S_1 and $T = S_2 - \frac{1}{n}S_1^2$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1, T) \\ &= K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1, S_2) - \frac{1}{n} K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1, S_1^2) \end{aligned}$$

By the product formula (Proposition I.3.3) we have

$$K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(Y, Y, \dots, Y, Y^2) = K_m^\mathcal{E}(Y, Y, \dots, Y) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_m \\ \pi < \hat{1}_m}} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(Y, Y, \dots, Y)$$

for any random variable Y , where $\pi_0 = \text{I} \mid \text{I} \mid \dots \mid \text{I} \sqcup$. Therefore the first term is

$$\begin{aligned} K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1, S_2) &= n K_{m-1}^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X, X^2) \\ &= n \left(K_m^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_m \\ \pi < \hat{1}_m}} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) \right) \end{aligned}$$

while the second term is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} K_{m-1}^{\mathcal{E}}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1, S_1^2) &= \frac{1}{n} \left(K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_m \\ \pi < \hat{1}_m}} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1) \right) \\ &= K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X) + n \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_m \\ \pi < \hat{1}_m}} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X) \end{aligned}$$

because each partition π in the sum has exactly two blocks; The difference of the two terms is $(n-1) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X, X, \dots, X)$ and vanishes. $\square$

Lukacs' theorem can be generalized to more general quadratic forms as follows. For different proofs in the free case see [HNY99, HKNY99]. We are grateful to H. Yoshida for bringing the latter to our attention.

Proposition 4.2 ([HNY99, Prop. 2.2]). *Let X_i be a sequence of $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. Gaussian random variables in the sense of Definition 1.1 and let $A \in M_n(\mathbf{R})$, $b \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that*

$$(4.1) \quad Ab = 0 \quad b^t A = 0$$

Then the linear form $L = \sum b_i X_i$ and the quadratic form $Q = \sum a_{ij} X_i X_j$ are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that b is a unit vector, i.e., $b^t b = 1$. In that case we can extend b to an orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{R}^n$, denoted $\{b_1 = b, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ where b_i has components $(b_{ij})_{j=1, \dots, n}$. We can express A in this basis as

$$A = \sum \alpha_{ij} b_i b_j^t$$

with $\alpha_{ij} = b_i^t A b_j$. By Maxwell's Theorem 2.4 the sequence $Y_i = \sum b_{ij} X_j$ has the same distribution as X_i . Our assumption (4.1) implies that $\alpha_{1j} = 0$ and $\alpha_{j1} = 0$ for all j and we can rewrite L and Q as

$$L = Y_1 \quad Q = \sum_{i,j=2}^n \alpha_{ij} Y_i Y_j$$

which are clearly $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. $\square$

Proposition 4.3 ([HNY99, Thm. 2.3]). *Let (X_i) be an $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. centered sequence satisfying the singleton condition and let $A = [a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathbf{R})$, $b \in \mathbf{R}^n$ be such that*

$$Ab = b^t A = 0 \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N} : \sum_i b_i^m a_{ii} \neq 0.$$

If $L = \sum b_i X_i$ and $Q = \sum a_{ij} X_i X_j$ are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent, then X_i are Gaussian.

Proof. The singleton condition implies that cumulants with singleton blocks vanish. Therefore it suffices to show that cumulants with a block of length greater than or equal to three vanish. We proceed by induction. Consider for $m \geq 2$ the cumulant

$$K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(L, L, \dots, L, Q) = 0.$$

We can expand it with the help of the product formula (Proposition I.3.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
K_m^\mathcal{E}(L, L, \dots, L, Q) &= \sum_{h: [m+1] \rightarrow [n]} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} \cdots b_{h(m-1)} a_{h(m)h(m+1)} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_{h(1)}, \dots, X_{h(m-1)}, X_{h(m)} X_{h(m+1)}) \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{m+1}} \sum_{\substack{h: [m+1] \rightarrow [n] \\ \ker h = \pi}} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} \cdots b_{h(m-1)} a_{h(m)h(m+1)} K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(m-1)}, X_{\pi(m)} X_{\pi(m+1)})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that each contributing partition π has at most two blocks and by the product formula

$$K_m^\mathcal{E}(X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(m-1)}, X_{\pi(m)} X_{\pi(m+1)}) = \sum_{\substack{\rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{m+1} \\ \rho \leq \pi}} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X)$$

with $\pi_0 = \text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---} \cdots | \text{---} | \text{---}$, and where $X = X_1$ has the same distribution as all the X_i . Using this we can continue

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\substack{\pi, \rho \in \Pi_{m+1} \\ \rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{m+1} \\ \rho \leq \pi}} \sum_{\ker h = \pi} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} \cdots b_{h(m-1)} a_{h(m)h(m+1)} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) \\
&= \sum_{\rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{m+1}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} \cdots b_{h(m-1)} a_{h(m)h(m+1)} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) \\
&= \sum_i b_i^{m-1} a_{ii} K_{m+1}^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{\rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{m+1} \\ \rho < \hat{1}_{m+1}}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} \cdots b_{h(m-1)} a_{h(m)h(m+1)} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, \dots, X)
\end{aligned}$$

We will now apply induction to show that all but the first term of the last summation vanish, and together with the assumption $\sum b_i^{m-1} a_{ii} \neq 0$ this will imply that $K_{m+1}^\mathcal{E}(X) = 0$. For $m = 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = K_2^\mathcal{E}(L, Q) &= \sum b_i a_{ii} K_3^\mathcal{E}(X, X, X) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\rho \in \{\text{---} | \text{---}, \text{---} | \text{---}\}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} b_{h(1)} a_{h(2)h(3)} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, X)
\end{aligned}$$

and because of the singleton condition all but the first summand vanish, showing that $K_3^\mathcal{E}(X, X, X) = 0$.

For $m = 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = K_3^\mathcal{E}(L, L, Q) &= \sum b_i^2 a_{ii} K_4^\mathcal{E}(X, X, X, X) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\rho \in \{\text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}, \text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}, \text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}\}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} b_{h(1)} b_{h(2)} a_{h(3)h(4)} K_\rho^\mathcal{E}(X, X, X, X)
\end{aligned}$$

For $\rho \in \{\text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}, \text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}\}$, the term vanishes by induction hypothesis (and because of the singleton condition). For $\rho \in \{\text{---} | \text{---} | \text{---}, \text{---} | \text{---}\}$ the coefficient of $K_\rho^\mathcal{E}$ is $\sum b_i b_j a_{ij}$ which vanishes by assumption on A and b . Now for $m \geq 4$ any $\rho < \hat{1}_{m+1}$ satisfying $\rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{m+1}$ has

exactly two blocks and one of the blocks has cardinality at least three, and the induction hypothesis implies that the cumulant vanishes. $\square$

Proposition 4.4 ([HKNY99, Prop. 2.2]). *Let X_i be $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. copies of the Gaussian random variable X . Then the quadratic form $Q = \sum a_{ij} X_i X_j$ with $A = [a_{ij}]$ symmetric has cumulants*

$$K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(Q) = \text{tr}(A^n) K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(X^2)$$

Proof. Indeed A can be diagonalized to $A = U^t \Lambda U$ with U orthogonal and by Proposition 2.4 the random variables $Y_i = \sum U_{ij} X_j$ have the same distribution as X_i and the cumulants of $\sum \lambda_i Y_i^2$ are

$$K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(\sum \lambda_i Y_i^2) = \sum \lambda_i^n K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(Y_i^2)$$

$\square$

Remark 4.5. The joint cumulants of arbitrary quadratic forms in Gaussian random variables are computed as follows. Let X_i be an $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. sequence of a Gaussian random variable X and let $Q_k = \sum a_{ij}(k) X_i X_j$ be quadratic forms where $A_k = [a_{ij}(k)]$ are not necessarily symmetric matrices. Then

$$\begin{aligned} K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m) &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{2m}} \sum_{\ker h = \pi} a_{h(1)h(2)}(1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(m) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_{\pi(1)} X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(2m-1)} X_{\pi(2m)}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\rho \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m} \\ \rho \in \Pi_{2m}^{(2)}}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} a_{h(1)h(2)}(1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(m) K_{\rho}^{\mathcal{E}}(X) \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_0 = \sqcap \sqcap \cdots \sqcap$. For free Gaussians (that is, free semicircular random variables) there is only one contributing partition, namely $\rho_0 = \lceil \sqcap \sqcap \cdots \sqcap \rceil$, and in this case

$$K_m^{\mathcal{F}}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m) = \text{tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m).$$

For classical Gaussian random variables, every pair partition ρ with $\rho \vee \rho_0 = \hat{1}_{2m}$ can be obtained from ρ_0 by permuting and flipping the pairs $(3, 4), (5, 6), \dots, (2m-1, 2m)$. A permutation of pairs corresponds to a permutation of the matrices A_k and a flip corresponds to replacing A_k by its transpose A_k^t . There are $(n-1)! \cdot 2^{n-1}$ ways to do this and we get

$$\kappa_m(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{\{2,3,\dots,m\}}} \sum_{\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, \dots, \varepsilon_m \in \{1,t\}} \text{tr}(A_1 A_{\sigma(2)}^{\varepsilon_2} A_{\sigma(3)}^{\varepsilon_3} \cdots A_{\sigma(m)}^{\varepsilon_m})$$

In the general case, these summands are weighted with the corresponding $K_{\rho}^{\mathcal{E}}(X)$.

Proposition 4.6 ([HKNY99, Prop. 2.3]). *Let X_i be an $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. Gaussian sequence and $A, B \in M_n(\mathbf{R})$ symmetric matrices. Then the quadratic forms*

$$Q = \sum a_{ij} X_i X_j \quad Q' = \sum b_{ij} X_i X_j$$

are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent if and only if $AB = 0$.

Proof. Assume that Q and Q' are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent. Then we can write cumulants in two ways:

$$K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(sQ + tQ') = \text{tr}((sA + tB)^n) K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(X^2) = (s^n \text{tr}(A^n) + t^n \text{tr}(B^n)) K_n^{\mathcal{E}}(X^2)$$

for $n = 4$ this implies

$$\mathrm{tr}((AB + BA)^2) + 2\mathrm{tr}(BA^2B) = 0$$

and therefore $\mathrm{tr}((AB)^t(AB)) = 0$, i.e., $AB = 0$.

For the converse, we will prove that more generally, the symmetric quadratic forms $Q_k = \sum a_{ij}(k)X_iX_j$ are $\mathcal{E}$ -independent if the matrices $A_k = [a_{ij}(k)]$ satisfy $A_iA_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Indeed, by the product formula (Proposition I.3.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_m \mathcal{E}(Q_{k_1}, \dots, Q_{k_m}) &= \sum_{h: [2m] \rightarrow [n]} a_{h(1)h(2)}(k_1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(k_m) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_{h(1)}X_{h(2)}, \dots, X_{h(2m-1)}X_{h(2m)}) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{2m}} \sum_{\ker h = \pi} a_{h(1)h(2)}(k_1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(k_m) K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(X_{\pi(1)}X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(2m-1)}X_{\pi(2m)}) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{2m}} \sum_{\ker h = \pi} a_{h(1)h(2)}(k_1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(k_m) \sum_{\substack{\rho \leq \pi \\ \rho \vee \rho_0 = \hat{1}_{2m}}} K_{\rho}^{\mathcal{E}}(X) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\rho \in \Pi_{2m}^{(2)} \\ \rho \vee \rho_0 = \hat{1}_{2m}}} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} a_{h(1)h(2)}(k_1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(k_m) K_{\rho}^{\mathcal{E}}(X) \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_0 = \square \square \cdots \square$. Each ρ is a pair partition in which each block connects two different blocks of ρ_0 in such a way that the resulting graph is connected. If we number the blocks of ρ_0 from 1 to m , we can define a cycle $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$ starting at block 1, choosing an arc of ρ which connects it to some block $\sigma(1)$, choosing the other arc starting in block $\sigma(1)$ etc. Using the symmetry of the matrices A_k we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ker h \geq \rho} a_{h(1)h(2)}(k_1) \cdots a_{h(2m-1)h(2m)}(k_m) &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_m} a_{i_{\rho(1)}i_{\rho(2)}}(k_1) \cdots a_{i_{\rho(2m-1)}i_{\rho(2m)}}(k_m) \\ &= \mathrm{tr}(A_{k_{\sigma(1)}} A_{k_{\sigma(2)}} \cdots A_{k_{\sigma(m)}}). \end{aligned}$$

If the k_i are not all equal, the matrix product vanishes by assumption. $\square$

Proposition 4.7 ([HKNY99, Thm. 3.2]). *Let X_i be a sequence of $\mathcal{E}$ -i.i.d. copies of the Gaussian random variable X . Then the distribution of*

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i + a_i)^2$$

only depends on the number $\sum a_i^2$.

Proof. We show that the cumulants only depend on $\sum a_i^2$.

$$\begin{aligned} K_m^{\mathcal{E}}(Y) &= \sum_i K_m^{\mathcal{E}}((X + a_i)^2) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m}} K_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}}(X + a_i) \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_0 = \sqcap \sqcap \cdots \sqcap$. Since X is Gaussian, the blocks of each contributing π have size at most 2. Together with the condition $\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m}$ this implies that π is either a pair partition or π has 2 singletons.

$$= \sum_i \left(\sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m} \\ \pi \in \Pi_{2m}^{(2)}}} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X + a_i) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m} \\ \pi \notin \Pi_{2m}^{(2)}}} K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X + a_i) \right)$$

In the first term there are only cumulants of order 2 which are invariant under translations, therefore we can forget the a_i . In the second term, there are exactly 2 singletons and by Lemma I.3.8 we have for such partitions π that

$$K_\pi^\mathcal{E}(X + a_i) = a_i^2 K_{\tilde{\pi}}^\mathcal{E}(X)$$

where $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi_{2m-2}^{(2)}$ is the partition obtained from π by removing the two singletons.

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_i \left(K_m^\mathcal{E}(X^2) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m} \\ \pi \notin \Pi_{2m}^{(2)}}} a_i^2 K_{\tilde{\pi}}^\mathcal{E}(X) \right) \\ &= n K_m^\mathcal{E}(X^2) + \left(\sum a_i^2 \right) \sum_{\substack{\pi \vee \pi_0 = \hat{1}_{2m} \\ \pi \notin \Pi_{2m}^{(2)}}} K_{\tilde{\pi}}^\mathcal{E}(X) \end{aligned}$$

□

A converse of this theorem holds in classical and free probability, but we were not able to find a generalization.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Hiroaki Yoshida for bringing to our attention the papers [HNY99, HKNY99] and we particularly thank Philippe Biane for a careful reading of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [Bry95] Bryc, W., *The normal distribution*, Lecture Notes in Statistics, vol. 100, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, Characterizations with applications.
- [BS96] Bożejko, M., and Speicher, R., *Interpolations between bosonic and fermionic relations given by generalized Brownian motions*, Math. Z. **222** (1996), 135–159.
- [Buc01] Buchholz, A., *Operator Khintchine inequality in non-commutative probability*, Math. Ann. **319** (2001), 1–16.
- [BV95] Bercovici, H., and Voiculescu, D., *Superconvergence to the central limit and failure of the Cramér theorem for free random variables*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **103** (1995), 215–222.
- [Fel71] Feller, W., *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II.*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1971.
- [GM02] Guţă, M., and Maassen, H., *Generalised Brownian motion and second quantisation*, J. Funct. Anal. **191** (2002), 241–275.
- [HKNY99] Hiwatashi, O., Kuroda, T., Nagisa, M., and Yoshida, H., *The free analogue of noncentral chi-square distributions and symmetric quadratic forms in free random variables*, Math. Z. **230** (1999), 63–77.
- [HNY99] Hiwatashi, O., Nagisa, M., and Yoshida, H., *The characterizations of a semicircle law by the certain freeness in a C^* -probability space*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **113** (1999), 115–133.
- [Kin72] Kingman, J. F. C., *On random sequences with spherical symmetry*, Biometrika **59** (1972), 492–494.

- [KLR73] Kagan, A. M., Linnik, Y. V., and Rao, C. R., *Characterization problems in mathematical statistics*, Wiley, 1973.
- [Leh02] Lehner, F., *Cumulants in noncommutative probability theory I. Noncommutative exchangeability systems*, Preprint, arXiv:math.CO/0210442, 2002.
- [Mar39] Marcinkiewicz, J., *Sur une propriété de la loi de Gauss*, Math. Z. **44** (1939), 612–618.
- [Nic96] Nica, A., *R-transforms of free joint distributions and non-crossing partitions*, J. Funct. Anal. **135** (1996), 271–296.
- [SW97] Speicher, R., and Woroudi, R., *Boolean convolution*, Free probability theory (Waterloo, ON, 1995), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997, pp. 267–279.

FRANZ LEHNER, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK C, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT GRAZ, STEYRERGASSE 30,
A-8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: lehner@finanz.math.tu-graz.ac.at